

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DWIGHT A. CAMPBELL,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 24-cv-10394

Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

CLINTON VAZQUEZ, *et al.*,

Defendants.

/

---

**ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT (ECF No. 1) WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

On February 16, 2024, *pro se* Plaintiff Dwight A. Campbell filed this action against Defendants Clinton Vazquez, the Logan Township Police Department, and the United States Marshals Service. (*See* Compl., ECF No. 1.) Campbell initially failed to pay the required filing fee or file an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, and the Court subsequently dismissed his Complaint without prejudice. (*See* Order, ECF No. 6.) Campbell then asked the Court to re-open the case and set aside the dismissal order (*see* Mot., ECF No. 17), and the Court did so. (*See* Order, ECF No. 22.) In the order setting aside the dismissal order, the Court told Campbell that it would be issuing a separate order directing “Campbell to submit certain documents and information to the Clerk of the Court so that the United States Marshals Service [could] serve the Defendants with the Complaint.” (*Id.*,

PageID.61.) It then explained to him that because “[t]he Complaint cannot be served by the Marshals Service without the information identified in that order, [] it [was] important that Campbell follow and comply with those instructions upon receipt of the order.” (*Id.*, PageID.62-63.)

The Court issued that service-document order on December 18, 2024. (*See* Order, ECF No. 24.) That order directed Campbell to “complete and present to the Clerk’s Office the following documents to effect service in this case within fourteen (14) days [...]: One (1) copy of the [C]omplaint for each defendant; Two (2) USM 285 forms for each defendant; [and] Three (3) summonses for each defendant.” (*Id.*, PageID.65.)

Campbell failed to provide any of the identified service documents to the Clerk’s Office. Thus, on February 12, 2025, the Court issued an order granting Campbell one last chance to submit the required service documents to the Court. (*See* Order, ECF No. 25.) In that order, the Court warned Campbell that if he failed to “submit the required service documents” by March 24, 2025, “or otherwise provide proof that he has served the Defendants with the Complaint, the Court [would] dismiss this action for failure to prosecute.” (*Id.*, PageID.67.)

On March 12, 2025, Campbell submitted some, but not all, of the required service documents to the Court. More specifically, he failed to provide summonses for all of the Defendants. (*See Dkt.*) This is not a mere technical violation of the

rules. Without these documents, the Court cannot serve the Defendants and proceed in this case.

Accordingly, because Campbell has failed to comply with the Court's orders and has failed to submit all of the required service documents as directed, the Court **DISMISSES** his Complaint (ECF No. 1) **WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Matthew F. Leitman

MATTHEW F. LEITMAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: April 1, 2025

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on April 1, 2025, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Ryan

Case Manager

(313) 234-5126